

REMARKS

Applicant first thanks the Examiner for the thorough examination. Presently pending in this application are claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 31-40. Claims 1 and 40 are independent. Claims 1 and 3-9 are amended and claims 31-40 are new. No new matter is added. Indeed, support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and figures. Claims 2, 10, 17-30 are canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 17-30, which are directed to limiting activation of the workspace, are canceled so that the presently claimed invention can be of focus in the present examination. Applicant reserves the right to pursue canceled claims in a continuation application.

Independent claim 1 and the other dependent claims (claims 3-9) were voluntarily amended to clarify aspects of the presently claimed embodiments and not to overcome prior art. As amended, independent claim 1 is directed to a method for an event driven workspace that upon detecting a trigger, a plurality of windows in a workspace are displayed according to a second state, which comprises a different arrangement of the plurality of windows than the first state. The arrangement of the windows according to the second state provides a user with a more desirable arrangement of the plurality of windows in the workspace based on the defined trigger. The other independent claim (claim 40) recites similar limitations.

Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the disclosure was objected to because of a few informalities. Those have been addressed by the amendments made herein.

Claim Objections

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 18 and 19 were objected to because of informalities. This objection no longer applies as claims 18 and 19 were canceled.

Double Patenting

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 was provisionally rejected under 35 USC §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application No. 11/415,395, which is a continuation of the present application. It is worthy to note that the present application and the copending Application No. 11/415,395 are presently co-owned. At the time of filing this

response, claim 1 has been withdrawn (the only currently pending claim) from Application No. 11/415,395. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 4 of the Office Action, originally presented claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,339,392 to Risberg and Skeen (hereinafter “Risberg”). In view of the voluntary amendments, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that Risberg is not an anticipatory reference as the reference does not disclose a method or system for an event driven workspace such as disclosed and presently claimed by Applicant. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

For instance, with respect to amended independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Risberg does not disclose an event driven workspace that upon detecting a trigger, a plurality of windows in a workspace are displayed according to a second state, which comprises a different arrangement of the plurality of windows than the first state. The arrangement of the windows according to the second state provides a user with a more desirable arrangement of the plurality of windows in the workspace based on the defined trigger.

For at least this reason, Risberg fails to anticipate the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 40 from which all dependent claims ultimately depend, and therefore are patentable over Risberg.

Conclusion

In view of at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that the invention as claimed in claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 31-40 patentably distinguish over the Risberg reference. Therefore, Applicant submits that each of these claims is in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration. If Examiner believes that further dialog would expedite consideration of the application, Examiner is invited to contact Mark Triplett at (312) 476-1151 or the undersigned attorney or agent.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Dated: March 7, 2007

By: Jori Schiffman/

Jori R. Schiffman

Reg. No. 57,628

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 913-0001
Fax: (312) 913-0002